DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 352 918 HE 026 118

AUTHOR Bess, James L.
TITLE Hidden Educators and the Seduction of College Students: Higher Education's Competitive Disadvantage. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE Oct 92
NOTE 36p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Minneapolis, MN, October 29-November 3, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Child Caregivers; College Faculty; Colleges; Continuing Education; Educational Assessment; *Educational Improvement; *Educational Needs; *Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; Futures (of Society); Higher Education; Institutional Cooperation; Institutional Mission; Mass Media Role; *Nontraditional Education; *Outcomes of Education; Postsecondary Education; Professional Education; *Relevance (Education); Teachers; Undergraduate Study; Universities; Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting

ABSTRACT

This paper suggests that undergraduate higher education is at a severe competitive disadvantage vis-a-vis other socializing and educating agencies in society and proposes some strategies to compensate for this disadvantage. First, the paper notes difficulties with mandated assessment as a major means of educational improvement. It then identifies changes in college culture and the society at large and suggests that time spent trying to improve the internal efficiency of colleges and universities may be subject to diminishing returns. It proposes alternative or concurrent efforts on the external (rather than internal) educational front that may provide a greater return on investment than assessment alone is able to do. The paper then considers the reasons colleges have gradually lost their hold over the education of American youth, and identifies six "hidden educators" in America: (1) the media, (2) childcare workers, (3) elementary and secondary school professionals, (4) graduate and professional school educators, (5) workplace culture conditioners, and (6) managers of continuing education agencies. It is argued that colleges and universities need to collaborate with and lead these other educational influences. Specific suggestions for colleges to increase their influence with each these six societal educators are offered. (Contains 26 references.) (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED352918

HIDDEN EDUCATORS AND THE SEDUCTION OF COLLEGE STUDENTS: HIGHER EDUCATION'S COMPETITIVE DISADVANTAGE

James L. Bess

New York University

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE 026 118

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Minneapolis, Minnesota, October 31, 1992.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James L. Bess

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ASHE

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Marriott City Center, Minneapolis, Minnesota, October 29 - November 1, 1992. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

The explanation of the survival of any social institution is often expressed in terms of the positive functions it serves for the larger society. With respect to higher education, however, despite asseverations of its value from insiders with vested interests (however genuinely felt), it has become obvious to most observers that the community that utilizes college graduates, as well as the graduates themselves, have become increasingly disenchanted with the educational product received, especially given the expense. Several reactions from the academy have followed. One is a denial or business-as-usual approach by those institutions with a more secure market niche. The other is an institutional introspection -- a search for ways to make the graduates they send out more valuable. This paper questions not the motive to improve, but the possibility of improvement. Very simply, higher education is at a severe competitive disadvantage vis-a-vis other "hidden" socializing and educating agencies in society. What the nature of this disadvantage is and what we must do about it is the substance of the discussion that follows.

First Reactions: Assessment as Savior

Faced with pressures from state legislatures, accrediting agencies, parents, and others to increase effectiveness in undergraduate education, college and university leaders have directed much of their attention recently to the search for more systematic techniques for assessing and improving the services

they provide. An "assessment" movement has suffused the higher education establishment, introducing new methods of measuring teaching and learning, faculty research productivity, student life services and administrative decision making (Hutchins & Marchese, 1990; Astin, 1991, Ewell, 1985, 1991). The hope is that improvement in the observation and measurement techniques themse lves will in turn provide accurate and needed data to make operations more "efficient" and that the improved efficiency will result in outputs that are seen as more valuable to the purchasing publics. Either costs will be reduced or/and larger numbers of higher quality graduates for the same price will be produced. It is an approach somewhat like the efficiency-oriented time and motion studies associated with the scientific management theories applied to the profit-making sector in the early part of this century (cf. Bell, 1961), though with the useful addition of input and environmental variables (Astin, 1991). It is also similar to the "total quality management" approaches currently being touted (Seymour, 1992).

While the assessment movement has forced a rational redirection of attention in higher education to the components of production (teaching and learning) and will doubtless lead to needed improvements in "efficiency" in institutions of higher education, much more important is an underlying larger issue -- the "effectiveness" of colleges and universities with respect to

the social functions they serve.* In point of fact, though few institutional leaders would admit it (or may even be aware of it), even with greater economies and efficiencies within their institutions, colleges and universities in the United States today find it increasingly difficult to accomplish the educational functions expected of them by American society. Whatever "value added" students receive in college is severely vitiated by prior conditioning, current competition, and lack of reinforcement after graduation. This failure may be accounted for in large part by changes within higher education and by the profound social and cultural transformations that have occurred over the last several decades in this country and the world at large. Let us briefly identify these.

The Components and the Shape of Modern Education

First, student bodies have changed. In contrast to the homogeneity of students attending college in the closely-knit, "Gemeinschaft"-type society of the early days of this country, there is now an extremely variegated set of racial, ethnic, religious, regional, and age-segregated subpopulations. Further, the fragmentation of the curriculum in higher education, especially in the aftermath of the student freedoms of the

---

* There is, of course, an intimate relationship between efficiency, which is concerned with the relationships between inputs and outputs, and effectiveness, which is focussed on system outputs, particularly as viewed by the external public (cf. Pfeffer & Salancik (1978)). More on this below.

1960's, is one evidence of the deconstruction of a single ideology in colleges and universities (see, for example, NEH, 1989). Clearly, no single value perspective alone is desirable in a pluralistic democratic system. What <u>is</u> considered desirable, indeed essential, is the inculcation in students of capacities to discern values, understand them, adjudicate among them, adopt a personal posture toward them, and act on them -- in short -- to "value value." With the advent of more relativistic or pluralistic doctrines, however welcome, has come a significant lessening in higher education of the commitment to values for themselves, despite the recent reformations of curriculum in some colleges (cf. Rosovsky, 1990).

Second, this change within the institutions of higher educaation has been accompanied in society by a significant structural subdivision or differentiation of social agencies providing educational functions. That is, the processes of socialization, enculturization, and education formerly mandated to higher education are now carried out by a quite extensive and diverse group of institutions and social agencies that not only are not connected to one another but are often in hidden competition.

Whereas in prior years, religious institutions, schools, and family could and did collaborate to engender both a more unified belief system and a set of values that could endure with continued external societal support through the life course,

there is no such coherence now extant (Society for Values, 1978). Moreover, without some integration of "internal" and "external" educators, the separate social agencies go their own independent ways. As Dewey (1916) notes:

> Hence one of the weightiest problems with which the philosophy of education has to cope is the method of keeping a proper balance between the informal and the formal, the incidental and the intentional, modes of education. (p. 10)
>
> As societies become more complex in structure and resources, the need of formal or intentional teaching and learning increases. As formal teaching and training grow in extent, there is the danger of creating an undesirable split between the experience gained in more direct associations and what is acquired in school. (P. 11)

The absence of an internal commitment to values for themselves is thus further compromised by a lack of a coalescing or reinforcement external system to anticipate or support the effects of college on students' values. The separate socializing and educating institutions go their own independent ways, with variance both within and between them. The diversity of values in the culture results in a social system that not only does not solidify college learning, but may subvert it.

What this suggests is a critical need for a radical re-conceptualization of the modes of delivery of educational services in the United States. A new kind of social institution in American society is in order. Very different from centralized governmentally dominated educational agencies in other parts of

the world, this one would connect, coordinate, bridge, and integrate the educating institutions in society without controlling them. The argument to be presented here is that colleges and universities can not and must not be content to remain merely one of the players in the construction of a viable social and economic system, but must come to occupy a more central, "focussing" position. The thrust of this paper is to suggest that time and energy spent to improve internal efficiency of colleges and universities, while valuable, may now be subject to drastically diminishing returns. Efforts at asssessment of teaching, research and administration may, in fact, be futile, in the face of the now intense competitive disadvantages that higher education currently encounters as it struggles to influence young people. While the competition (to be delineated below) is often unintentionally adverse to the educational objectives of higher education, it is nonetheless powerful. More important, through the inadvertent oversight of educators, it is virtually neglected -- left on its own to undermine the success of the higher educational enterprise. In the early 1970's, Ivan Illich (1970) called for the disestablishment of schools (in this case elementary and secondary schools) in favor of "learning webs" composed of other institutions that presumably more directly and relevantly address student needs. Today, however, those other institutions have become so morally vapid, impotent, or even

subversive (viz. the content of prime-time television) that they can not and do not support the positive benefits of colleges and universities. Rather, they undermine them.

The Value of Value

Most sociologists agree that a modicum of agreed-upon values is necessary to hold a social system together. It used to be the case in this country that the common school could perform this integrating function. As Lawrence Cremin notes:

> In essence, the proponents of the common school were seeking the nurture of a common core of sentiment, of value, and of practice within which pluralism would not become anarchy.
>
> What they set out to do, and in large measure accomplished, was to convince the American people that a common educational experience was the only means potentially capable of coping with these Herculean tasks. (Cremin, 1951, p. 221)

Today, with so vast and diverse a population, neither the common school nor the college or university can alone perform this function.* Indeed, there is some question whether a common experience can reflect a common core of sentiment if there is no longer a core that can be called and accepted as "common" (viz., the vociferous debates over the Eurocentric curriculum). Conceivably, however, the core value that may be sufficient is the commitment to value itself, as noted above. It is therefore reasonable to believe that if the idea of the "value of value" is generally valid and needs to be effectively inculcated. (It is

beyond the scope and orientation of this paper to suggest the specifics of this curriculum revision. Suffice it to say that it is needed.)

But if common background and schooling alone can no longer provide it, given the educational competition, a new mechanism must be established for the purpose of ensuring that at least some "common" value is communicated in concert by all the social agencies engaged in educational functions.

Cross Boundary, Not Internal Efforts Are Needed

This paper suggests a number of alternative, or at least, concurrent efforts on the external rather than internal educational front that may at this point in our educational history provide a greater return on investment than assessment, which addresses efficiency questions. It argues for more explicit collaboration rather than competition with other educating agencies. Centralized control by any socializing agency (including higher education -- see Burton Clark, 1984*) over the minds of young people is justifiably abhorrent in most democratic societies. This paper suggests a dramatically different central, yet indirect, role for higher education and presents some practical suggestions for more involvement of colleges and

---

* Clark (1984) suggests that with rising awareness of social problems, most societies come to expect too much of higher education, vascilating between centralized and market-driven educational structures in the vain hope that educational solutions will also address other problems.

universities with other socializing agencies. Colleges and universities can no longer stand alone. They must find ways to induce collateral institutions to share the responsibility.

What follows below is first a discussion of the relationship between internal efficiency and external effectiveness to show why further attention to the inside dimensions will produce only small increments in improved output. Next is a consideration of the reasons colleges have gradually lost their hold over the education of American youth. The section following identifies six "hidden educators" in America and describes their influence. The final parts sketch out very roughly a new role for higher education in contemporary society, embracing these educators.

The Correlation Between Internal and External Success

It is important first to explicate further the argument that higher education must direct its evaluative attention outward, toward effectiveness, rather than inward, toward efficiency. There is, of course, an intimate interactive relationship between efficiency and effectiveness. Efficiently produced products and services (higher quality and less expensive) are more readily sought by clients, who, through their purchases, in turn provide resources to finance the continuation of the organi-

zation's activity.* Even in the face of changing market and social conditions, sophisticated, environmentally-sensitive institutions can often adapt to the shifting circumstances by attending to internal efficiencies (purchasing cheaper or more plentiful raw material -- e.g., less qualified students -- better training, better coordination and control, etc.) and producing modified products or services that will be more likely to ensure success and survival. Aggressive, pro-active, intelligent management, through sagacious internal job and organizational design and leadership, can often produce superior products and services that lead to long-lived organizations.

However, while problematic internal conditions may be remediable by concerted action of institutional members, external circumstances are often not as subject to intervention and manipulation. There are sometimes other critical determinants of effectiveness that may be beyond the control of those in leadership positions in organizations. On occasion, despite transformation of its products, the very mission of the organization may become obsolete and/or impossible to amend. The March of Dimes' objective of ridding the world of polio was both achieved and rendered void when the polio vaccine was discovered (though that organization later rededicated itself to

---

* The negative hypothesis is also true. Internal inefficiencies may be the cause of poor and excessively costly products and services, while external ineffectiveness (e.g., rejection by clients) may result in insufficient continuing resource inputs to finance operations.

other missions). In addition to mission obsolescence, there are times when inputs required by the organization to produce its goods and services are no longer available. As one example, if the raw material entering the institution (again, for higher education, students and knowledge inputs) can no longer be obtained or is of low quality or/and the knowledge and tools used to transform the raw material are faulty, or/and there are extraneous uncontrollable influences on the transformation processes, the output of the institution will not be forthcoming or will be of low quality. For example, natural resources may no longer be obtainable or technologies used in the past may become outmoded. In other words, there are occasions when circumstances beyond the control of the organization make it no longer possible to perform its external mission, no matter how hard the members of the organization work at improving internal efficiency.

Such may be the case for colleges and universities. No matter how "efficient" they become, there are now other external conditions that render their efforts considerably less than effective. Particularly with respect to the education of traditional-age students, there powerful influences on students in addition to those available within the institution, and college graduates are today increasingly subject to those other outside influences. The argument to be made here is that higher education has inadvertently yielded to <u>external</u> agencies much of the power to accomplish its central mission and responsibility -- the

moral, intellectual, and psychological development of America's youth in their formative years of 18-22. In the light of this shift, it is doubtful that even significant increments in institutional "efficiency" will result in greater institutional "effectiveness" in achieving desired goals. But we must examine what those goals are.

Traditional Goals of Higher Education

In forecasting the "post-industrial society," Daniel Bell (1976) reifies the place of knowledge and cognition and points to institutions of higher education as "axial" -- figuratively and literally central to the satisfaction of society's exploding information needs through its research and dissemination functions and its training of individuals to perform those functions. But colleges and universities today typically have goals for their students that are broader than vocational or occupational training, the knowledge and skills for which can be closely measured in graduates. Indeed, in the industrially developed societies supporting these educational institutions today, expectations of college graduates go beyond simple possession of vocational skills (Jencks & Riesman, 1968, pp. 28ff). Higher education as a whole has traditionally accepted a wider, social responsibility (although parents often have somewhat more pragmatic agendas for their children). Whether institutional philosophies are liberal or conservative, most colleges and

universities purport to play powerful parts in improving the ability of young people on graduation to cope successfully with personal work and social dilemmas and to contribute intelligently and ethically to the well-being of their fellow human beings. The question, then, is whether higher education must become "axial" in the non-cognitive area.

Interestingly, these non-cognitive objectives, are usually treated by educators as important by-products of the college curriculum and (until fairly recently) extra-curricular life. Courses are designed to facilitate the transfer of knowledge, and cognitive achievement is the usual standard of success. The claim is made that there is a strong correlation between cognitive and affective growth in students, and that certain courses (e.g., in the "liberal" arts) encourage new awareness, sensitivities and tolerance of different perspectives, followed by a commitment to higher values. Hence, in most developed societies, there is an assumption that higher levels of education will lead not only to more sophisticated minds but to more well-adjusted, sensitive, caring, and ethical citizens.

In the past, there may have been some justification for this argument. In the last century, for the relatively small percentage of the nation's youth in higher education, colleges and universities, along with family, religion, and local community, were the major sources for students of intellectual

thought and ethical foundations and were significant providers of leadership training. Campuses were insulated, they catered to a homogeneous, upper-class constituency, and the curricula they mounted encouraged the examination of values along with knowledge acquisition. By 1870, as Oscar & Mary Handlin (1970) note, colleges and universities were increasingly becoming the "custodians of culture." Indeed, the Handlins suggest, "culture replaced religion as the guide to thought, behavior and emotion" (p.50).

Today, a vastly different set of conditions exists. The sources of influence have multiplied, and the media of communication have become both more powerful and more insidious. The quandom insulating culture of the college campus has yielded to a variety of external purveyers of value (cf. Moffat, 1989). While some years ago, Jacques Barzun (1968) could observe that higher education had become a "residual" institution, taking on all of the social service functions that other institutions no longer wanted to hold as their own, the reverse has also now become true: higher education has inadvertently divested itself of its own critical functions yielding at least partly to "hidden educators" whose influence is both unknown and unaffected by colleges and universities. Further, the student body is now extremely heterogeneous, within and especially across campuses, and many aspects of the curriculum, especially in non-selective colleges, do not seriously address the non-cognitive (read in

this case, "value") dimensions of education. But even if they do, there is some considerable doubt as to their "effectiveness." Furthermore, current efforts at assessing and improving the "efficiency" of the delivery of educational services may have only small incremental effects on the exit qualifications of today's college graduates. Far from being the "custodians of culture" as the Handlins suggested, today's colleges are the external culture's handmaiden. To reiterate, the reason for this condition lies in the gradual, if no longer subtle, rise of unintended "competitor" educators (to be named below) which higher education has largely ignored.

"Hidden Educators"

It is not that college and university administrative leadership and faculty lack ideology, goals, knowledge, commitment, or even funds to be competitive (or, more positively, collaborative). Nor is it that the output of institutions of higher learning is not needed. (Colleges are not, after all, producing buggy whips.) It is that as a social institution, higher education shares its education and socialization roles with a large number of social institutions. As Cremin (1990) also suggested in his "interactionist" perspective, formal educational institutions form only a part of the matrix of organizations performing educational services. He urged that historians study the whole. The message for higher education is that leaders of

institutions must become more proactive with respect to other educating forces in the society.

At least six newly powerful shapers of culture exert critical impacts on the intellect and ethical groundings of our nation's youth.* Moreover, the former collaborators with higher education -- parents, religious institutions and neighborhood culture -- have diminished in importance. The new shapers or "hidden" educators of college youth are: the media, childcare workers, elementary and secondary school professionals, graduate and professional school educators, workplace culture conditioners, and managers of continuing education agencies. Some of these new sources of influence precede the students' college experience, some are coterminous with it, and some follow it. Each, however, significantly and directly affects the fundamental value structure and motivational dispositions of college students at some point in their lives. For example, for students who are inconsistently or adversely socialized in early childhood experiences, the task of influencing them in college becomes much more difficult. Similarly, when negatively affected in post-college life, they lose some of what they gained in college and regress to earlier stages of psycho-social and cognitive development. Unless those in higher education can have an effect on these "educators," it is unlikely that its improved efficiency

---

*N.B. These are not necessarily "new," but "newly powerful" and potentially malevolent. The list is arbitrary, illustrative only, and certainly not exhaustive.

will result in students exiting the pipeline with characteristics that are desirable enough for the public to judge the institutions as effective.

If higher education is to accomplish its missions, it must not only continue assiduously in its traditional undergraduate teaching role that focuses attention directly on its young clients, but it must also find ways to make an important impact on the critical outside forces that compete with it for influence. It must develop and carry out an intensive coordinated program of educating and then collaborating with the "hidden educators" in American society. In some cases, there are already examples of fruitful alliances, but in inchoate form. Higher education must develop an agenda that reaches out to and work with the six sources of influence noted above so that its own unique mission for undergraduates in college classrooms is nurtured by a culture that supports its efforts, rather than ignores it -- or worse, undermines it.

The Power of the Competition

Let us review the power of these six new forces, beginning with the most pervasive, invasive and longest lasting.* As is well known, the communication media, particularly television, exert an enormous and immediate influence on our values tastes and ultimately behavior by virtue of their omnipresent enveloping nature. Young people not only can not escape its messages,

* The presentation here is overdrawn somewhat for emphasis.

implicit and explicit, they often are not even aware of its impact. The rapid fire bites of comedic or violent stimuli and the cool passivity engendered by the television medium have been well-remarked. As a result, young people today are less able and less inclined than ever to be initiators of activity in their own or anybody else's behalf. They are and expect to be mere audiences. When they do get involved in projects, they can sustain their attention to the task for only a relatively short time. And they are as shallow in their thinking about life issues as the heroes and heroines of the talk show/soap opera/sitcom fantasies they so faithfully follow. Neil Postman (1985) notes that the danger lies not so much in the jejune character of television entertainment specifically billed as entertainment as in the degradation of news, politics, religious thought, etc. to the level of entertainment.

The media are omnipresent and influential throughout the life span. They attack pre-schoolers, school-age children, college attenders, and graduates. What is particularly distressing about this phenomenon is not only that most young people continue to be relatively uninformed, uninterested and uninvolved in important matters. As Jefferson noted, talent and leadership are unequally distributed in society. With more than thirteen million students now engaged in higher education, there exists a large proletariat to whose cultural needs higher education must give attention. Equally important, however, are

the minds, values, and goals of the country's brightest youth (those for whom the systems of higher education in earlier years were designed) who may also have be lost to the influence of colleges and universities. The media have submerged them into the undifferentiated masses, inured to concentrated attempts at influence by the higher education sector.

Let us consider next the second competitor. With more than half of America's women now employed full-time, the responsibility for early childhood education falls increasingly to temporary day-care workers. Here again, the sheer amount of contact time with children renders the influence of these workers extraordinary. Small wonder that America's progeny enter school predisposed with the tastes and interests of those whose values adults may not even know, much less agree with. To leave these child-care workers uninformed and uneducated is to predestine youngsters to enter college largely unprepared for the message, meaning, and modes of communicating used in colleges. Contrast this with the Japanese mother's important complementary role to that of the school (notwithstanding the workplace sex discrimination that leaves that home educator role only to women).

Elementary and secondary school teachers and administrators constitute the third important educational force affecting what happens in colleges and universities. The obviousness of their importance only serves to highlight the necessity for them to be

linked intimately with the higher education system that follows on their achievements. Allied with these educators are profit-motivated textbook publishers who pander to the values of decision makers, particularly at the state level (Delfattore, 1992).

The fourth key influencers are professional graduate schools. These include schools of law, business, and medicine. The graduates of these institutions exert enormous influence over what America stands for, is and will become. In point of fact, however, organizationally, these professional schools are relatively autonomous in the usual relaxed if not anarchic organizational firmament of undergraduate and graduate schools in most universities. The predominant pattern of decentralized organization and governance in universities often yields control over curriculum in professional schools to self-serving faculty who, understandably, maximize the prestige returns to their schools by preaching and breeding a "success-at-any-cost" ethic (if this is not a malapropism) in their students. If, after all, graduates of these institutions are themselves <u>key</u> culture shapers in American society, can undergraduate education be expected to work if policy makers do not pay attention to what happens to students in graduate schools?

The fifth shaper of ideas and values is the workplace. Eight or so hours a day spent at work constitutes about half of the adult's waking hours. What a person believes in is both

manifestly and subtlely influenced by how he or she is treated in the work environment, how peers, superordinates, and subordinates establish relations, and how leaders identify and control the quality of the work. The impact of college has been shown through research to be severely vitiated when experiences after college do not support value and attitude changes engendered in college. If colleges and universities are serious about wanting to make a difference in the lives of their students, they must be equally concerned with what happens to them after college.

Finally, a very large number of Americans are pursuing their vocational and avocational interests through non-credit continuing education. Again, the question arises as to whether this avenue of communication can be left completely in the hands of autonomous professional educators (however well-intentioned they most certainly are). There is little attempt to share the higher education agenda with them. The necessity to make certain that the undergraduate education effects that faculty and administrators worked so hard to achieve are reinforced at the succeeding levels of postsecondary education is sadly not recognized.

In sum, these six social agencies in American society today have a far more significant impact on the efficacy of <u>undergraduate</u> education than in years past. The critical functions formally the province of higher education are no longer supported by other social institutions that now play powerful

educating roles as well. These agencies can and do wield their influence in an unconsidered and ungainly fashion, uninhibited by the conscience and knowledge of educators with broad understandings of educational practice and social consequences of education of college youth. Because the six hidden educators themselves emerged in response to a society that was itself ineluctably transformed by circumstances of changed technology, social and economic structure, and culture, it is unlikely that undergraduate education can regain its erstwhile influence by continuing in its traditional modes. Given the now limited "purchasing power" on American youth, the higher educational system can no longer expect to capture the market of partially developed intellects and souls that once were handed to it as a matter of course.

The New Role of the Contemporary College or University

If any agency in society is to assert the moral imperatives that are necessary to carry the nation, indeed the world, to a higher state, it is logical that higher education be that agency. The aggregation of trained professional thinkers in a semi-cloistered environment allows the time for careful planning of undergraduate experiences that have the potential for influence and change. Colleges and universities must now expand their agenda of influence to include the shaping of the influencers of society. They must engage in a concerted effort to educate the

hidden educators -- the media, the day-care workers, elementary and secondary school personnel, the graduate and professional schools, the workplace leadership, and the continuing education educators in what it believes is important, what counts, what matters. This is not to suggest that higher education speak in a unified voice and look for converts to any one position. This article does not by any means suggest a return to or formulation of a conservative tradition of any one classical or other curriculum (though, in truth, as noted earlier, a "liberal education" is the foundational bias). Rather, it sugggests that higher education needs to take a central role and responsibility for reinserting value itself into the society. But it is an argument for "structural" rather than ideological change. Just as higher education, thankfully, can exist and thrive in a system of diverse institutions, so also can the set of larger "hidden" institutions co-exist without a single voice prescribing values or actions. Short of a mechanism for linkage, however, America will proceed without a system of communication of intellectual and ethical ideas, without value systems that give the society some direction and motivate its citizenry to work toward the achievement of its goals in a context of care. It can no longer be naively assumed by many that the non-cognitive or affective goals of undergraduate education can be accomplished in four short years in a college or university alone. Help is needed before, during, and after, and it must be the business of college

and university leaders to influence those helpers on its own behalf. As Ortega y Gasset (1944) noted, an educational institution,

> when it is truly a functional organ of the nation, depends far more on the atmosphere of national culture in which it is immersed than it does on the pedagogical atmosphere created artifically within it. (pp. 29-30)

Expanding the Outreach Roles of Higher Education

Such an expansion of the domain of higher education will require some considerable rethinking of its centrality in the dynamics of a society's growth and development. It will also demand a reconsideration of the techniques of articulation among the disparate influencing sectors. While it is easy, of course, to identify and lament any problem, it is more dificult to prescribe a solution. The following, however, are a very few suggestions for colleges and universities that might constitute a speculative prolegomena for action:

1. MEDIA

   The media already know that they undervalue the intellect of their viewers. How can higher education convince them to change their programming?

   a. Conduct and publish research showing conclusively how ratings will improve with higher

quality productions.

b. Conduct and publish research showing the negative consequences on American culture and morality.

c. Mount a series of public service announcements to the general public showing them why it is important to change their viewing habits.

d. Offer service courses to media executives informing them of the impact of their decisions.

e. Work through advertisers and the advertising field to guide them to more responsible expenditures.

2. CHILD CARE WORKERS

This labor market must be influenced both directly and indirectly.

a. Establish child care centers at universities under the direction of undergraduate students (prospective parents in training) under faculty supervision.

b. Establish day care centers in workplaces under the guidance of persons trained at universities.

c. Offer free, credit-bearing courses to day-care workers with a "certificate" issued on completion that would carry weight with parents hiring child-care persons.

d. Work toward the professionalization of day care, with concommitant control and licensing of day-care centers by both professional associations and government agencies.

3. ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL PROFESSIONALS

For too long a low-status occupation with low pay, this profession needs to upgrade the quality of the personnel it recruits and the quality of the

professional training it gives in graduate schools.

a. Teach school professionals new means of communicating and interacting regularly with parents via new programs of home and school visits. The intimate connection between school and family life has been severed, in part by the institutionalization of two-income families.

b. Instruct new and old teachers in new methods of classroom teaching that incorporate the predominant patterns of informal learning in the home (visual/auditory rather than print media).

c. Transform the pro-forma recertification programs for teachers into real learning experiences for working teachers that emphasize cultural awareness.

d. Teach teachers how to recognize and incorporate values education in their classrooms. (Resurrecting John Dewey would seem propitious at this juncture.)

e. Arrange for universities to move more aggresively into the organization and management of schools, including the development of curricula that mesh with those of higher education.

4. GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL EDUCATORS

As valuable are the linkages of these professionals with their fields, these educators may be seduced into the success ethic and standards that lie outside of rather than within the field of education.

a. Integrate the subject of "professional ethics" into every course. It is beginning to be introduced into professional school

curricula, but usually only in the form of a single course.

b. Bring these professional schools closer to the academic community and its values through new organizational structures that force the integration of teaching and research with those in the basic disciplines. Educational leaders in professional schools tend to be based pragmatically in their fields, thus biasing them toward the world as it is, rather than as it should be.

5. WORKPLACE LEADERS

Even farther out of the educational loop, organizational leaders need to see themselves as responsible educators, too.

a. Reach out to America's corporate leaders and bring them into the academic community on a regular basis, both as resources and as learners. (Indeed, as teachers, they will probably learn more than their students!)

b. Educate the educators in the corporate sector. Currently educational activities in business and industry are run by industrial/organizational psychologists mandated to fulfill only short-term, pragmatic corporate objectives.

c. Humanize the workplace by offering in-house, university-developed liberal arts courses and workshops for managers at all levels.

6. CONTINUING EDUCATION

Most instructors in continuing education programs are practitioners brought to the college or university to share their up-to-date wisdom. But they also share their marketplace values.

a. Require continuing education faculty to

be certified as educators by insisting on exposure to the higher education mission. (We stodgy academicians may learn a thing or two also in this process.)

b. Integrate the schools of continuing education with the more traditional academic community. They tend now to be shunted off as mere money makers, not educators.

c. Just as with elementary and secondary school curricula, make certain that values and value education are given their due in courses of all subjects.

Summary

As stated at the outset, higher education no longer has the authority, power and resources alone to educate America's youth in a manner that provides deep and longlasting values and dispositions, however diverse these may be. Responsibility for accomplishing its missions is now spread over many different institutions. Hence, efforts at improving internal "efficiency" through assessment may be doomed to small, though certainly welcome, incremental improvements. The educational needs of the society and the institutions (presently existing or to be created) serving those needs must be carefully reconceived. There will always be a requirement for some agency -- hopefully separate and free of government control -- to link educating institutions and to provide a focus and force for educational efforts. Presently, colleges and universities claim naively to play a significant and almost exclusive role in knowledge

transformation, enculturation and socialization, and facilitating growth and development for traditional age students. As noted earlier, this was not always the case in past times nor in other countries, where other cultural institutions shouldered some part of the burden. It may have been naive for colleges and universities, even those whose residential experiences may approximate "total environments," ever to believe that they could take over the primary higher education mission. In hindsight, it is now clear that other agencies have come increasingly to share the responsibilities. It is time that colleges and universities learn how to collaborate with them.

There are at least two action options to avoid a continuation of the present drift in overall American higher education strategy. One is to attempt to reinvigorate higher education with a traditional centralized role and relatively weak outreach to other educating institutions. As noted above, this approach has been shown to have disastrous long-term side effects and further does not seem appropriate to an open democratic society. A second is to distribute some functions and leave higher education to what it can do best -- namely, designing educational policy and, through a strong outreach program, disseminating that policy and helping it become implemented. Under this latter arrangement, an integrated, carefully articulated "system" embracing the six hidden educators would be established to accomplish the long

range educational purposes of the nation and world. Lacking a coherent, systemic approach, the isolated four-year segment of undergraduate education will be increasingly relegated to a mere short-term playground of entertaining ideas that never make a lasting impression -- or worse, set up the nation's youth with unrealizable expectations that are quickly disabused in the competing post-graduate climate and practices of the real world.

Colleges and universities have never been completely alone in their educating missions (Bailyn, 1960; Cremin, 1965). In recent years, however, other agencies in society have begun to play such important roles that they may be squeezing out the unique contributions that higher education plays. Unfortunately, the failure of educators in colleges to recognize and adjust to the significant loss in their potential for directly influencing their students will make it even more difficult to justify expenditures on higher education in the years to come. Faced with competition from these new entities, higher education, in its direct and immediate instructional activities, will increasingly play a minor role in determining how society's values are instituted and changed, how its economic and moral agendas are established, and how its requisite social functions are carried out. As noted earlier, this is not to suggest that institutions of higher learning are meant to be proselytizers or promoters of particular perspectives. They are, however, enculturating mechanisms. Whether that is interpreted radically, liberally or

conservatively by the some three thousand institutions of higher learning extant, the latter may no longer possess the capacity to accomplish their own or the collective mission. The competition is simply overwhelming. The new "hidden" educators are too powerful. Echoing the sentiment of Ortega cited above, Nevitt Sanford (1962) remarks,

> The colleges are not quite, or nothing but, playthings of forces over which no one has any control. What saves them from this status is the element of rationality in our social processes; where we have knowledge of conditions and are free to use our intelligence we are able, within limits, to influence the course of events.

Can current efforts at improving internal internal efficiency in higher education also make a difference in its effectiveness? Yes, but without some outside help, colleges and universities may find themselves at an increasing competitive disadvantage.

References

Astin, Alexander W. Assessment for Excellence: The Philosophy and Practice of Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education. New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan, 1991.

Bailyn, Bernard. Education in the Forming of American Society. New York: Vintage Books, 1960.

Barzun, Jacques. The American University, How It Runs, Where It Is Going. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

Bell, Daniel. The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture Into Social Forecasting. New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Bell, Daniel. "Work and Its Discontents: The Cult of Efficiency in America," in The End of Ideology. New York: Collier Books, 1961, 227-272.

Clark, Burton R. "Conclusions." In Perspectives on Higher Education: Eight Disciplinary and Comparative Views, edited by Burton R. Clark. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984, pp. 256-273.

Cremin, Lawrence A. The Common School, An Historic Conception. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College Columbia University, 1951.

Cremin, Lawrence A. The Genius of American Education. New York: Vintage Books, 1965.

Cremin, Lawrence A. Popular Education and Its Discontents: The Inglis and Burton Lectures. New York: Teachers College Press, 1990.

DelFattore, Joan, What Johnny Shouldn't Read. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

Dewey, John, Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education. New York: Macmillan, 1916.

Ewell, Peter T. (ed.). Assessing Educational Outcomes. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Ewell, Peter T. "Assessment and Public Accountability: Back to the Future." Change 23 (November/December 1991): 12-17.

Handlin, Oscar & Mary F. Handlin. The American College and American Culture. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.

Hutchins, Patricia and Theodore Marchese, "Watching Assessment -- Questions, Stories, Prospects," Change, September/October, 1990, 22, 5, 12-38.

Illich, Ivan. Deschooling Society. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1970.

Jencks, Christopher & David L. Riesman, The Academic Revolution. New York: Doubleday, 1968.

Moffatt, Michael, Coming of Age in New Jersey: College and American Culture. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1989.

National Endowment for the Humanities. 50 Hours: A Core Curriculum for College Students. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Humanities, 1989.

Ortega Y Gasset, Jose. Mission of the University. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1944.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey & Gerald Salancik. The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.

Postman, Neil. Amusing Ourselves to Death: Public Discourse in the Age of Show Business. New York: Viking, 1985.

Rosovsky, Henry, The University: An Owner's Manual. New York: W. W. Norton, 1990.

Sanford, Nevitt, "Higher Education as a Social Problem." In The American College: A Psychological and Social Interpretation of the Higher Learning, edited by Nevitt Sanford. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962, pp. 10-30.

Seymour, Daniel T., On Q: Causing Quality in Higher Education. New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan, 1992.

Society for Values, The Search for a Value Consensus. New York: The Rockefeller Foundation, September, 1978.